



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,547	10/03/2001	Glen Jorgensen	18405-115	1371

30623 7590 10/28/2004

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY
AND POPEO, P.C.
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

SORKIN, DAVID L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/970,547

Applicant(s)

JORGENSEN ET AL.

Examiner

David L. Sorkin

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18, 19, 35 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18, 19, 35 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01 October 2004 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-16, 18, 19, 35 and 36 are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) which require that "The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support and antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description". Specifically, references to passages being "axially aligned", "dedicated", and "dedicated for" are not founded in the specification. Applicant must appropriately amend the specification and/or claims without adding new matter to comply with 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1-16, 18, 19, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention:

5. Independent claims 1 and 36 require that a central hub have "a first axially aligned dedicated passage way" and "a second axially aligned dedicated passageway". While the instant specification as filed does not use the exact term "axially align" to refer to any passageway, it is understood from the text and drawings that 23, 63 and 106 (of three separate embodiments) are axially aligned passageways. However, no hub is disclosed to have more than one axially aligned passageway. Requiring a hub to have two axially aligned passageways is considered to be new matter. Additionally, the specification explains that while the peripheral passages (22, 62) are associated with "unique and independent fluid pathway[s]" for "each processing chamber", the axially aligned passages (23, 63) constitute "a single fluid pathway...that communicates with all the expressing bags or chambers" (see page 10, lines 5-8). Thusly, the axial passageways are not *dedicated* passageways dedicated to communication with a particular chamber.

6. Claim 35 is considered to include new matter because the originally filed specification does not describe an "axially aligned dedicated passageway dedicated for fluid communication with a first chamber". Instead the axially aligned passageways (23,

63 and 106) are not dedicated for communication with a particular chamber, but instead communicate with all expressor chambers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Juhasz et al. (US 3,503,326). Note: regarding claim preamble of claim 35 particularly, the statement of intended use “for a continuous flow centrifuge”, it has being held that, “where a patentee defines a structurally complete invention in the claim body and uses the preamble only to state a purpose or intended use for the invention, the preamble is not a claim limitation” *Rowe v. Dror*, 42 USPQ2d 1550, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Note also regarding the statements of what passages are “for” and/or “dedicated for”, “the manner or method in which such a machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself” *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967). Further regarding claim 35, Juhasz ('326) discloses an apparatus comprising a plurality of axially aligned processing chambers (10 and/or 13), each chamber including an axial opening (see col. 2, lines 41-45; Fig. 1) housing a central hub (6), wherein a respective central hub of a respective chamber includes at least one first axially aligned dedicated passage (7) dedicated for communication with a first chamber and at least one second passage (8) dedicated for communication with a second chamber.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant points out that passage 8 of Juhasz ('326) is not axially aligned. However, passage 7 of Juhasz ('326) is axially aligned. As claim 35 requires only one axially aligned passage, the Juhasz ('326) anticipates claim 35.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Sorkin whose telephone number is 571-272-1148. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 -5:30 Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Sorkin

David L. Sorkin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723